

1017. h 2
2

HISTORICAL and CRITICAL
REMARKS

ON THE
BRITISH TONGUE
AND ITS
CONNECTION

WITH OTHER

LANGUAGES

Founded on its STATE in the

WELSH BIBLE.

By THOMAS LLEWELYN LL.D.

L O N D O N

Printed for J. BUCKLAND in Pater-noster-Row, T.
BECKET and Co. in the Strand and W. HARRIS
No. 70 in St. Paul's Church-Yard.

M.D.CC.LXIX.

[Price Two Shillings.]

K

HISTORICAL and CRITICAL

REMARKS

ON THE

BRITISH TONGUE

AND ITS

CONNECTION

WITH OTHER



L A N

W E L S H B I B L E

By THOMAS LEWIS, F.R.S.

L O N D O N

Printed for J. Baskin and in New-Street-Road, T. Baskin and Co. in the Strand and W. Baskin No. 10 in St. Paul's Church-Yard.

E R R A T U M.

Page 62. Line 11, for *πικλιν* read *πικλιν*.

~~to solicit the patronage of the~~
~~PRINCE of WALES for the follow-~~
~~ing remarks, and more especially~~
~~for the language on which they~~
~~are founded. The great conde-~~
~~scension and readiness with which~~
~~the ambitious wishes of the author~~
~~gratified, is hereby most respect-~~
~~fully acknowledged: But for the~~
~~same readiness to favor and pa-~~

TO HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS

G E O R G E
PRINCE of WALES.

S I R,

BY patronizing a design to support the necessitous orphans of ancient Britons, for whom the law has made no provision in London, your ROYAL HIGHNESS has already shewn your regard to the principality. From this very early instance of a readiness to do them good, the natives of that country will infer a disposition in future to countenance every attempt for their advantage worthy of encouragement. Presuming upon this disposition so flattering to my views, I have ventured
to

to solicit the patronage of the PRINCE of WALES for the following remarks, and more especially for the language on which they are founded. The great condescension and readiness, with which the ambitious wishes of the author in behalf of his work have been gratified, is hereby most respectfully acknowledged: But for the same readiness to favor and patronize the British tongue, your ROYAL HIGHNESS may depend upon the applause and benedictions of thousands.

I am SIR

Your ROYAL HIGHNESS's

most obedient devoted and

faithful humble Servant

Thomas Llewelyn.

HISTORICAL and CRITICAL

REMARKS

ON THE

BRITISH TONGUE, &c.

INTRODUCTION.

THE British tongue is a language daily spoke by thousands and by hundreds of thousands in the principality of Wales. It is a language in which a considerable number of books have been composed and published. The Reverend Mr. Moses Williams, a Gentleman to whom his country is many

B

way

ways indebted, printed above fifty years ago a catalogue of books *, published relative to Wales and mostly in the Welsh tongue; which catalogue contains the names and sometimes brief accounts of near two hundred books of different sizes. Since the printing of the above catalogue, several other books, both original compositions and translations have been published in the same language. Reading among the lower class of people is become much more common and general in that country now than formerly. Since the year 1737, two hundred and twenty thousand persons and upwards, we are informed §, have been taught to read in one particular sort of schools, called circulating Welsh charity schools; first set up by the late Reverend and truly pious Mr. Griffith Jones; and since his

* For the perusal of this curious and uncommon catalogue, I am obliged to my communicative friend Richard Morris, Esq; the very worthy President of the Cymrhodorian Society.

§ Welsh Piety for the year 1768.

death,

death, supported by the voluntary contributions of well disposed persons. To those who are duly informed of this state and use of the language, remarks upon it need no apology.

As little occasion does there seem to be of any apology for founding these remarks in some measure on the British translation of the scriptures. It was thought necessary to fix upon some state of the language for a proper foundation; and none seemed more fit for this purpose than the state of it in the Welsh bible. The bible is the common book of christians: it appears in the language of every Protestant country: in Wales especially it is a principal book, the most known and the most read of any: and it has the best claim to be reckoned the standard for the language. To this, other publications being mostly of a later date accommodate themselves; and hence their stile derives its manner and coloring. Tho' in general the supplies of this book have not been adequate to the

wants or demands of the people, yet at present they are in the way of procuring pretty ample provision. A quarto impression with a short commentary, consisting of about ten thousand copies is now printing by subscription at Carmarthen: and at the same time, another edition in octavo containing twenty thousand books, is carrying on at London, under the patronage of the society for promoting Christian Knowledge.

THE following remarks are not of a sort; they are therefore divided in the ensuing treatise, and thrown into two separate and distinct parts.

Part the first takes up the British tongue in its present state, and surveys its general complection and features, as it appears in the Welsh bible. With a view to the claims of the language to self-sufficiency and purity, it examines the terms or words of it in the gross; and enquires whether they are original and native or foreign and borrowed. It traces its connection

nection and intercourse with other languages; and considers what it has gained or suffered by their means.

The second part enters more thoroughly into the genius and constitution of the Welsh tongue; it resolves and analysis its several parts and materials; examines its peculiar nature and properties; and enquires how far it is regular and after the manner of the English and other languages; or wherein it remarkably varies and differs from others whether ancient or modern; and with all the conciseness of which the author was master consistent with clearness, it points out the advantages or disadvantages of the British, for composition and for ease and strength of expression.

A long disuse of the language had well nigh totally disqualified the writer, and rendered him almost quite inferior to such an attempt. He was most sensibly affected with the prospect of the difficulties in the second part, and thereby like to have been deterred intirely from taking it in hand. If in the execution

wants or demands of the people, yet at present they are in the way of procuring pretty ample provision. A quarto impression with a short commentary, consisting of about ten thousand copies is now printing by subscription at Carmarthen : and at the same time, another edition in octavo containing twenty thousand books, is carrying on at London, under the patronage of the society for promoting Christian Knowledge.

THE following remarks are not of a sort ; they are therefore divided in the ensuing treatise, and thrown into two separate and distinct parts.

Part the first takes up the British tongue in its present state, and surveys its general complection and features, as it appears in the Welsh bible. With a view to the claims of the language to self-sufficiency and purity, it examines the terms or words of it in the gross ; and enquires whether they are original and native or foreign and borrowed. It traces its connection

nection and intercourse with other languages; and considers what it has gained or suffered by their means.

The second part enters more thoroughly into the genius and constitution of the Welsh tongue; it resolves and analysis its several parts and materials; examines its peculiar nature and properties; and enquires how far it is regular and after the manner of the English and other languages; or wherein it remarkably varies and differs from others whether ancient or modern; and with all the conciseness of which the author was master consistent with clearness, it points out the advantages or disadvantages of the British, for composition and for ease and strength of expression.

A long disuse of the language had well nigh totally disqualified the writer, and rendered him almost quite inferior to such an attempt. He was most sensibly affected with the prospect of the difficulties in the second part, and thereby like to have been deterred intirely from taking it in hand. If in the execution

tion of it attempted notwithstanding, any material mistakes are committed, it is hoped that this consideration will be admitted as some extenuation of his defects; and that his well meant endeavour, tho' it may be deficient and in some instances erroneous, will yet be acceptable in the main, and of real service to his country.

OBSERVATIONS on languages are commonly dry and abstruse, or else run in rough and uneasy channels. It is too seldom that they contain much of what is new and worth knowing; and seldomer still that they afford any thing very entertaining. But remarks on the British tongue cannot be expected to go in a known and beaten track; and they must at least have the character of novelty to recommend them. The attempt is undoubtedly new, and it is believed that the subject is capable of throwing some new light on the nature of languages in general.

The

The author has wished to be able to handle the subject in such a manner as might yield information without being tedious, not only to his countrymen, but to those also who are unacquainted with the language on which these remarks are founded. How far he has succeeded in the attempt and accomplished his wishes, must be left to others in due time to determine.

THE fate of languages like that of several eminent persons has been a good deal unfortunate. Living they are neglected and slighted; but dead they are commended and decorated with all the ornaments of learning and eloquence. The English the living language of Great Britain &c, spoken daily by millions, has yet been less studied in Britain than the Greek tongue which is spoken by nobody: and the British another living language of thousands in this land has yet been as little or less cultivated here

here than the Arabic. English writers of the first character have remonstrated against such a conduct in behalf of the English tongue ; and have recommended to their countrymen the cultivation and thorough knowledge of their own language. In the same manner I could wish to recommend to every inhabitant of Wales, the right understanding of his Mother tongue. While it is yet alive, and in daily use, let it be studied and cultivated : and should it ever be its fate to be reckoned among the dead, may it then meet with the usual treatment and honors of dead languages.

PART THE FIRST.

Effect of other languages on the British tongue.

CHAP. I.

Ancient state and extent of the British language.

WE are informed by the venerable Bede*, that in his time five different languages were used in common by the several inhabitants of this island: these five were the English, the British, the Scottish, the Pictish and the Latin. This was about a thousand years ago. For a long while this number has been reduced to three, the Welsh, the Erse and the English; or rather, if the two first

C

be

* Eccles. Hist. beginning.

be only different dialects of one and the same language, the present number will be two, the British and the English—the last, though the youngest, is at this day by far the most general and extensive—the other, though now confined within narrower limits, is yet much the most ancient; and was very probably in former days more general and extensive than the English is now, or perhaps any other modern European tongue.

Two thousand years ago the state of languages, in these western parts of the world, seems to have been much more simple and uniform than at present. The British alone was used through England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland; and as should seem likely, it was the general, the common language of great part of the continent besides. It seems to have been the language of the ancient Celtæ, as well as of the ancient Britons: and these Celtæ under different denominations spread themselves over several countries of Europe. We find them in France, in Italy and

and in Spain under the different names of Belgæ, Galli, Celtæ and Celtiberi. In Germany, and more easterly and northerly, they went under the appellations of Cimbri, Cimmerii &c. And we read of some of their settlements as far as Greece and Asia minor *.

If ever the British tongue thus generally prevailed, in such different climes, and in such distant countries; it is scarce possible, that it should have been every where quite uniform and alike. It must have been diversified and broke into numberless varieties and dialects. But what these dialects were, or what their peculiarities, we know not.

As Britain itself in those days was divided into a multitude of little states and principalities; the language of its inhabitants could not have been entirely similar and uniform. Subjects of different kingdoms and provinces, especially when they have but little correspondence with each other, will have different dialects and

C 2

varieties

* Histoire des Celtes par Pelloutier.

varieties of speech. We find this frequently to happen in different counties, in no distant parts of the same country, and under the same government.

If the ancient inhabitants of this island had ever any considerable intercourse with Phœnicians, Carthaginians, or other foreigners of a speech quite different from their own; they would then in all probability adopt some foreign words or expressions, and incorporate them with their own stock. But of this also we have no full and certain account. And supposing such an event to have happened; words thus adopted, at a period so distant, could not now be distinguished from the native and original terms of the language.

Those times are too obscure—too remote for our reach. In hundreds of instances, they leave us uncertain and dissatisfied in our inquiries; we must therefore descend lower down, and to much later times, ere we arrive at the due distance, or fix ourselves in the proper station, whence we may be able to distinguish;

guish; whether there be any thing exotic and adventitious in the composition of this tongue; and which of its words are natives or which are foreign.

In descending for this purpose so low as the time of the reformation; and in considering the state of this subject as it stands in the Welsh Bible; we shall take the language at a considerable disadvantage. The Welsh Bible is not an original composition but a translation; and translations can hardly be expected as pure and unmixed as original compositions. It is also the translation of a book of a peculiar kind, where the same liberty must not be taken as in translating books of a different sort. It is further a translation undertaken and accomplished with fewer helps and under more disadvantages than most other versions of the same book *. Due and proper allowances therefore should be made for these circumstances, while we attend to this subject, and examine

* Historical account of the British versions and editions of the Bible.

amine how far the language of this version may have been affected by intermixtures from other tongues.

The languages which may be supposed to have had any effect in this case must be—Either the original languages of the Old and New Testament, whence the translation was made—Or the languages which at different times have prevailed in this country, and must have affected the language of its original inhabitants. Each of these will be found to have had some share in this matter.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Effect of the Hebrew language.

TOGETHER with the Greek, the Latin, the English, and perhaps all other translations of the Old Testament; the British version seems in certain cases to have acquired something of a Hebrew phraseology and turn of expression.

Yn y dydd y bwyta di o hono, *gan farw y byddi farw*, in the Welsh Bible, Gen. ii. 17. and in the day thou eatest thereof, *dying thou shalt die*, in the margin to the same passage in English, are expressions which sound well, and convey a strong and full meaning in both languages. They are not however in the stile of British legislation, nor of the laws of Howel Dda; and so in a great many other similar instances where the Hebrew idiom and manner is preserved in our translation.

It has further adopted and retained multitudes of single words from the Hebrew language. Besides long catalogues, and almost whole books in the Old Testament, containing little more than the Hebrew proper names of different persons and families; it retains Cerub, Eden, Jehova, Sabbath, and many others, which are mere Hebrew words untranslating, only disguised by being clothed in common letters. But these Hebrew terms and turns of expression ought not to be esteemed as defects in this translation, at least not as peculiar to it, seeing they are to be met with in every version of the Old Testament; and even to a considerable extent in the original Greek of the New. And it might have been deemed an idle affectation in our translators to have attempted avoiding them.

Excepting terms of this cast, and perhaps some few others, such as Aber, Caer, Sach &c. we have, as far as I can find, hardly any words in the British tongue of clear Hebrew complection and affinity.

Supposing

Supposing the Hebrew to have been the original language of mankind, and the common parent of all other tongues, as is generally supposed; in that case numbers of common words, evidently of Hebrew parentage, might be expected to appear in this, and in every other version of the Old Testament. But if we entertain such an expectation we shall be disappointed. And whoever compares a chapter or a page of the Hebrew Bible with the corresponding page or chapter in the Greek, in the Latin, in the English, in the Welsh, or perhaps in any other European version; whoever, I say, will be at the pains to make such a comparison, will be able to discover the plain and certain origin of but very few words.

It is commonly said, that the British and the Hebrew are similar languages; but by this must be understood; not that they seem to be derived the one from the other, or that there are a great many radical words the same in each; but only that

D there

there is a similarity of sound in certain letters of both alphabets; that they are alike in some peculiarities of construction, especially in the change incident to several letters in the beginning of words. If any thing farther is intended hereby, it will be more, I believe, than can be warranted and supported by a fair comparison of the two languages.

CHAP.

C H A P. III.

Effect of the Greek tongue.

THE British version, together with the Latin, the English, and most other translations of scripture, has adopted and retained, with little variation, several words from the Greek tongue. These it derives from the septuagint version of the Old Testament and from the original language of the New. Hence Bible itself, the general title for the whole book, and Apocrypha for a principal division of it—Hence Genesis and Exodus, Chronicles and Psalms, and the names of many other particular books of the Old Testament—Hence a great many words of various sorts throughout that part of scripture, and it may be yet more in the New Testament—Hence Angel, Apostol, Efengl, Eglwys, and multitudes of other terms peculiar to sacred and theological subjects; and these words of

Greek extraction and affinity will be found to be much more numerous than those of Hebrew origin, in every version of the Bible for these western parts of the world.

WHATEVER tongue may have been the primitive and original language of the human race; the Greek seems to have been the most general and diffusive of any, and to have had the most universal effect upon other languages. It seems to have been the parent language of sciences and of arts, at least to have been the principal vehicle of their communication and conveyance through the world. And we find in the Bible, in treatises upon almost every subject, and also in several occupations and employments of life, abundance of words evidently borrowed from this tongue. These are in general technical terms or words peculiar to arts and particular professions. Those used in the Bible are principally of a peculiar nature and signification, and like the proper

per terms of arts or sciences ought to be retained through the various versions of scripture, and indeed through every treatise on those subjects to which such terms relate.

Besides these appropriated words, if I may so call them, liberally furnished by the Greek tongue, for the preservation and improvement of arts and of knowledge; there are others of Greek features and complection, of a still more general and extensive nature, which are found to be interspersed in great numbers through many or most of the languages of Europe.

The Grecians are said to have been the ancestors of the Romans, and the Greek tongue the parent of the Latin; and the Latin has been generally ready to acknowledge its obligation, and to claim the Greek for its mother tongue.

French authors, in behalf of their nation, have claimed affinity with the Greeks, and from that language have derived

derived a considerable part of their own.

The English also has been deduced from the same source. Through the Saxon, its more immediate ancestor, it has been traced up to the Teutonic or Gothic —languages used in the neighbourhood of the Greek, and of the same complection and kindred*.

Others have put in the like claim in behalf of the Celtic or British, which they affirm to be equally if not more nearly related to the Greek: and upon a comparison of both tongues together, several instances appear of a striking resemblance, not to say of sameness. Pezron has published a pretty large catalogue of words of this make; such as, *ang*, *awyr*, air; *βεν*, *bron*, breast; *γενιον*, *gen*, chin; *ὕδωρ*, *dwr*, water &c †.

These and other Greek and British words are so much alike that they coincide in sound and in signification, and are evident

* Clark on ancient weights and money.

† Antiquities of nations, book the third.

evident proofs of a very ancient affinity between these two tongues. How and when such a relation commenced may not now appear.

It is easy to say the Britons borrowed these terms from the Greeks; but it is not so easy to shew the correspondence between the two nations, by means of which such a loan might be negotiated in Greece, and the goods imported to this island. Besides this, the above words are the most unlikely of any to have ever been borrowed. Persons the fondest for borrowing never borrow their legs or arms; nor is it probable, that they should ever borrow the words by which these things are signified.

Every language and people must have them from the beginning. They cannot do without them any more than they can subsist without air or water, or live destitute of the most essential parts and members of their own bodies. It must seem therefore most reasonable to conclude,

clude, not that one of these tongues is derived from the other, but that they are both kindred languages, and proceed from one common origin.

Besides Hebrew and Greek terms communicated by the two original languages of scripture; the British language and the British version of the Bible have several words in common with those foreign tongues, which at different times have prevailed in this island. The first of this class, and that which has had the most general and extensive influence, is the Latin.

CHAP.

C H A P. IV.

Effect of the Latin tongue.

THE Romans, as history informs us, were the first invaders and foreign oppressors of this country. The Latin tongue was their language, and, with their arms, was extended over a considerable part of the terraqueous globe. It was used in Britain for some centuries, if not by the natives, yet by foreign legions and colonists, when Britain made a part of the Roman empire. When that huge and unweildy body crumbled to pieces, when the power of that people was broke and abolished, their language maintained its ground, and spread even yet farther. The Latin tongue became the general language of the church of Rome, and of the public exercises of religion in every country where that church was established. It became the language

E of

of schools, of senates, and of courts of law. It became the language of the learned in most countries in Europe, and the vehicle of all sorts of knowledge for hundreds of years. It became, in a sense, also the language of the unlearned, of numbers who understood not a word of it, wherein they were required to transact with God and with men the most important of their concerns. It is not at all surprising therefore, that this language should have formed a considerable part of almost every European tongue; that it should have become a principal ingredient in the composition of the French, of the Italian, and of other languages on the continent, and likewise intermix itself with those used in the different parts of this island.

It has intermixed itself with the English, and constitutes a main part, perhaps the most expressive and substantial part of that tongue. It has also undoubtedly affected the Welsh tongue, and introduced into the Welsh Bible words, which would never have appeared in it, had it not been
for

for the connections between this country and the Roman empire or the church of Rome.

From the Latin it has borrowed the name of distinction for the principal division of the Bible into Old and New Testament. To this tongue it stands indebted for Actau and Numeri, names of particular books in each of these Testaments; and from the same source it has derived Appello, Condemno, Ffurfasen, Tabernacl, Teml, and such like.

The distinction made above with regard to words of Greek complexion will equally apply to words of Latin features and affinity. Some of them are evidently derivatives; but they are appropriated terms peculiar to such and such subjects; and must be made use of whenever we treat on those subjects to which they belong. Others are of a more general nature and application, stand for things the most essential to man, and the most common in nature, and are utterly incompatible with all ideas of lending and bor-

rowing; and however they may resemble words of other languages both in sound and in sense, yet they can never be thought to have been derived or borrowed from them, by such as duly attend to this matter. Yet of this class are numbers of those terms, usually reckoned derivatives from the Latin. Thus *Corph* and *Corpus*, *Braich* and *Brachium*, *Dant* and *Dens*, the corresponding words in each tongue for *Body*, for an *Arm*, and for a *Tooth*, are evidently similar terms, and must have proceeded from the same spring; but they cannot be supposed to have been borrowed by one tongue from the other, any more than the things they signify can be thought to have been borrowed by one people from the other.

SOME curious persons have pretended to give us the exact proportion between the original words of the Welsh language and those words which it has borrowed from other tongues. Dr E. Bernard

Bernard tells us *, that one half of the words in Dr Davies's dictionary are of Latin origin. Mr E. Llwyd on the other hand says †, that the number of Latin words in this estimate is fixed too high; and that the true proportion between them and others in that dictionary is nearly the proportion of one to seven.—The difference is considerable, but

Non est nostri tantas componere lites.

I shall only take the liberty to observe, that Dr Bernard was undoubtedly a learned man, but no Cambrobrition: probably no master of the Welsh tongue; and judged only by resemblance and by a random estimate. He wrote his letter to Dr Hickee in 1689. In 1693, according to the Biographia Britannica and A. Wood, he married a beautiful young lady descended from some of the princes of Wales; after which he perhaps thought otherwise

* Letter to Dr Hickee at the end of Islandic grammar, quarto edition.

† Nicholson's Engl. Hist. Library, page 29.

otherwise of this matter; and though he *published* no formal recantation, the above letter was suppressed, and not suffered to be reprinted with the Islandic grammar on the republication of it in Hickes's works.

Mr E. Llwyd may have been equally learned, and a Briton. He was a perfect master of his native tongue, and took the pains to reckon up all the words in Davies's dictionary. He makes them to amount to about ten thousand, of which about fifteen hundred, somewhat less than a seventh part, he owns, might be like the Latin. But without aiming at mathematical exactness, in a subject so vague and uncertain, if we compare together a single chapter or paragraph of the Welsh and of the Latin Bible, we may see reason to suspect that even E. Llwyd's estimate is fixed full high. In the first chapter of Genesis in Welsh, I question whether there be a dozen words of evident Latin resemblance, or half a dozen in the first Psalm.

C H A P. V.

Effect of the English language.

THE English or the Saxon is another tongue by which the British language, and the British version of the scriptures, may be supposed to have been affected.

Next to the Romans, the Saxons invaded this country, and oppressed and plundered its original inhabitants. If we may depend on the account commonly given of their arrival here, they came into this island at first as friends and auxiliaries. They were invited over, not to stay a few weeks, like a party of Hessians or Hanoverians, but to remain for a time, like and instead of Roman legions, for continued protection and defence. Coming hither at first in this manner, we may suppose that, for a while, they would intermix with the natives and accommodate themselves to their manners and customs.

toms. How long any friendly intercourse subsisted, and particularly what effect such an intercourse might have upon the language of either people, cannot at present be ascertained.

When the Saxons, instead of auxiliaries, became the enemies of the Britons — even after they had plundered the natives of the greatest and best part of their country; all correspondence between the two nations doth not seem to have been wholly and constantly cut off. In the time of the heptarchy we find the Britons assisting some of the Saxon kings against others of the same race. When England became a monarchy, its subjects and its sovereigns appear to have visited the principality on several occasions. And still more, the two nations have now been one kingdom near five hundred years; a period considerably longer than that in which the Romans remained in this country.

In all this time it may seem impossible but the language of each must have been affected.

affected. Not only the names of persons, of places and of some peculiar subjects would become common to both people ; but several other words and modes of expression would be adopted by one from the other, and added to its own stock. Accordingly we find in each language several words of this sort; though they are not near so numerous as those which both have in common with the Latin; and it may be difficult to determine, in particular instances, to which of the two such common words did originally belong.

DR BERNARD, as referred to above, gives them all the honor of an English extraction, and assures us that they make a fourth part of the words in Dr Davies's dictionary. Mr Llwyd again took the pains to reckon them, and on the contrary deposes, that they make only about one in fifty of the words in that book; instead of five and twenty hundred, which make a quarter part of its number of ten
F thousand,

thousand, they hardly amount to two hundred; and even this reduced number he will not allow to be all of English parentage and descent, only like the English, of doubtful pedigree and birth, some from one language and the rest from the other.

This is a very great difference, and shews the uncertainty of the subject as well as the tendency and disposition of the writers. It is rather an affair of curiosity than of importance; it does not seem capable of much precision, nor to be of weight enough to require it: general and probable conjectures may be as much as can be expected; and even these conjectures will be different according to the different state of the language, with a view to which they may be particularly formed.

Take the language of Wales as used in conversation, especially on the borders, and you will find it to be part Welsh and part English, abounding with English words under a Welsh form. But take the
same

same language as used by some authors, particularly as used in the Bible, and you will find it to make a very different appearance. Words of resemblance in the Welsh and English will be but few; some there are, but not near the quantity which might have been expected; they are to be found in the greatest number in the first edition of the New Testament; we there meet with several words of plain English or Saxon derivation; as, from the English *courteous*, that translation had *cwrtais* for *addfwyn*; from *unprofitable* it had *amproffitiol*, instead of *ansuddiol*; instead of *Grawn win*, it had *grabs* for *grapes*; and instead of *goruchwilwr*, *steward*.

These have been corrected in subsequent impressions; and there may be still room for some farther amendment, and to strike out *cwmfforddus*, *concwerwr*, *bappus*, words of clear Saxon complection and features; and to give in lieu thereof *cyssurus*, *gorchfygwr*, *dedwydd*, terms of equivalent signification, but of more genuine British complection, and more consonant with the rest

of the language. Should this be done, English derivatives will stand very rare in that book, much thinner than such as are plainly analogous to the Latin, which will appear the more surprising; when we reflect on the length of time in which the English has been the general language of this country, considerably more than one thousand years; when we reflect that England and Wales have been one kingdom near half of that period; and when we reflect also on the number of English words continually used by the inhabitants of Wales, especially on the borders. But,

ROMANS and Saxons have not been the only foreigners who invaded this country, or deprived its inhabitants of their rights and liberties. Danes followed the example which others had set them; they disturbed and harassed the Saxons, scarce warm in their seats, and long infested and plundered every part of the kingdom. And after them the Normans invaded and oppressed the English and settled themselves

felves in their poffeffions. As to the languages of thefe foreigners, it does not appear that the Danifh tongue had any great effect on any of thofe ufed in this ifland. But the Norman language had an effect which was very extenfive and lafting.

In Normandy, duke William and his fubjects made ufe of the French tongue; when he became conqueror and king of England, we are told by fome of his hiftorians, that he attempted to learn the language of this country; and when he found that he could not mafter it, he wanted to deftroy it, and to introduce and eftablifh the French in its place. Though in this attempt he did not fucceed intirely to his wifhes, yet he brought his native tongue to be much in ufe. He dictated his laws and ordinances in that language; he commanded his Englifh fubjects to learn and not fail to make ufe of it on feveral occafions. In confequence of this probably, charters pleadings and ftatutes of this realm have been drawn up in the
French

French tongue; and this has had a considerable effect on the English language, and given it in many instances a French or Gallic air and complection: but it does not appear to have had any effect on the language of Wales. A party of Normans, it is said, seized upon Glamorganshire soon after the conquest; and some of the descendants of this party may remain there to this day: but I know of no traces of their tongue in any part of that county; and the Welsh Bible seems to be intirely free from every taint or mixture of this kind.

SUCH in general has been the effect of foreign tongues on the British, and on the stile and language of the Welsh Bible. It has admitted some words from the Hebrew and Greek tongues, and these seem to have been necessary and unavoidable, and did not proceed from any peculiar scantiness or penury of the language. All other translations have done the same,
and

and even the originals themselves have acted upon the same principle. For there are Greek terms intermixed with the Hebrew of the Old Testament, and some Latin among the Greek of the New: It has admitted some words also from the Latin and the English, neighbour languages, which have long prevailed in this island. It has made a more frequent and more plentiful use of the former; but it has admitted the latter very seldom and with a sparing hand. But,

There is another respect in which it has been affected by one or both the languages last mentioned: that is, its alphabet or letters have, as far as appears, been always nearly the same with the Latin or English; I do not mean as to the sound of the letters, but as to their form or character.

C H A P.

CHAP. VI.

Effect of the Latin alphabet.

WHEN letters or alphabetical writing were first introduced among the ancient Britons, or what characters they used in the beginning, doth not appear.

Cæsar tells us*, that in and before his time Greek letters or characters were used by the Gauls, the nearest neighbours of the Britons, with whom they had maintained long and frequent intercourse. Another author says†, that the same letters were used in Britain, and that the Druids in particular were well acquainted with the Greek tongue.

Under the word alphabet, in Rostrenen's French and Celtic dictionary, is printed a compleat set of characters taken from old inscriptions, found in Bretagne in France,

* Bell. Gall. lib. 6. c. 14.

† Elingii Hist. Græc. Ling. pag. 257.

France, and called by the author "the alphabet of the ancient Armoric Bretons." Though these inscriptions are undoubtedly posterior to the introduction of christianity, being found on chalices, crosses, and such like monuments; they may yet exhibit an alphabet of a more early date, possibly the alphabet once generally used by the ancient inhabitants of Gaul and Britain.

However that be, when the Britons became subject to the Romans, they adopted the Latin characters or alphabet, as appears from inscriptions and legends of money then coined in this country.

The oldest British manuscripts extant appear in what is called the Saxon or the Anglo-Saxon character *. And printed books

* Archæol. Britan. pages 7, and 225.

The Anglo-Saxon character is supposed by some to have been that used by the Saxons while in Germany, and brought with them to this island: but by others, who think the Saxons had no knowledge of letters before they came over to Britain,

books in that language have in general made use of the English types and characters of the times: in the sixteenth century they appear in what is called the black letter; and since then in the more common English or Roman.

BUT the Latin or English alphabet does not cleverly bend and accommodate itself to the temper and genius of the British tongue. It is sometimes redundant, affording two or three characters for one sound; all which except one are rejected by the Welsh. In other instances it is as deficient, and obliges us to join two or three characters to express one simple British sound. Several attempts have therefore

this character has been supposed to have been the alphabet of the Britons, and from them adopted by the Saxons; but on a very slight examination we shall find it no distinct alphabet, but the same with the Latin, only varied a little in about six or eight letters.

fore been made to reform this alphabet, and to match it better to the Welsh tongue.

In order to understand the nature of these attempts, I will here lay before the reader the following table, exhibiting at one view the several alphabets which appear to have been used at different times by the different inhabitants of this island.

To bring the following alphabets within the compass of one page, the j and the q, two Latin and English letters, are omitted.

The last letter in the fourth column is a make-shift of the printer for a strange character of which he had no type. So is the Greek diphthong & in the same column a little higher up. The same is to be understood also of the same characters where they occur in the body of the book. The Saxon types likewise are but indifferent, and seem to require some such apology.

v	v	—	—	—	v
u	u	s	w	q	w
—	—	—	—	x	x
y	y	y	y	y	y
y	y	y	—	—	—
ds	ds	G2	—	s	s

a	a	a	a	a	a	Sound
b	b	b	bh	b	b	Eng. v
c	c	c	c	ç	ç	peculiar
d	ð	d	dh	d	d	th in the
e	e	e	e	e	e	Eng. v.
f	f	ff	—	f	f	ng in King
g	g	g	gh	g	g	
h	h	h	ghh	h	h	
i	i	i	i	i	i	
k	k	—	—	k	k	
l	l	ll	lh	l	l	peculiar
m	m	m	m	m	m	
n	n	n	mh	—	—	
o	o	n	nh	n	n	
p	p	o	o	o	o	
r	p	ph	ph	p	p	Greek φ
s	r	r	r	r	r	
t	rh	s	rh	s	s	th in thro'
u	τ	t	t	t	t	
v	þ	th	th	th	τ	
w	ü	u	u	—	—	
x	—	—	—	v	v	
y	p	w	g	u	u	
z	x	—	—	—	—	
z	y	y	y	y	y	
z	ÿ	ÿ	ÿ	ÿ	ÿ	
z	z	—	—	z, zh	z, zh	

The several alphabets in this table are plainly of a family, and derive from one common head. The first column contains the Latin or if you will the English, which is exactly the same.—The second contains the Saxon differing only in a few characters.—The third exhibits the common British or Welsh.—In the fourth row are the improvements of the third proposed by Dr Rhys.—And in the fifth and sixth, two other amendments of the same proposed and recommended by Mr E. Llwyd; the first given by himself in the second and the two hundred and twenty-fifth pages of the *Archæologia Britannica*; and the other deduced from his preface.—A seventh column is added, giving the sound of some particular letters; where nothing is set down, the sound nearly coincides with that of the English or Latin.

One attempt to reform the common Welsh alphabet was made by Dr John David Rhys, a learned physician in the sixteenth century, and author of *Linguae*

Cymraecæ

Cymraecæ Institutiones Accuratæ printed in 1592. This author rejects the f, the ff and the w of the common alphabet. He rejects also all doubling of the same letter, as dd and ll; and instead of the w he substitutes a character like the Greek diphthong ε, and gives a character nearly of this form γ for a sound somewhat resembling the y.

To compensate for the rejection of the double consonants, and to express more fully the different sounds of the letters, he adds an h to each consonant; thus, bh, ch, dh, gh &c. through all the consonants in the alphabet, the s only excepted.

To exemplify and recommend this scheme, the author wrote a Welsh address to his countrymen on his own plan, and prefixed it to the above book. But I do not find that he has ever been followed by any one person: and the address itself has, I apprehend, been less read, as the language of it seems so awkward

ward and disguised; that it is neither pleasant nor easy to read it.

This attempt not succeeding: Mr E. Llwyd projected another method to new-model the alphabet of this language; and published it in his *Archæologia Britannica*, page the second; and again more fully, page two hundred and twenty-five.

This learned and laborious writer banishes the c and calls back the k. He substitutes the Greek χ for the ch, and the Greek λ for the double l. He gives us the English v for the single f, and assigns to this last the sound of the double f. Instead of the g, or rather besides it, he introduces the Saxon \mathfrak{g} , and other Saxon characters, as δ , \mathfrak{f} , \mathfrak{p} , \mathfrak{r} , τ and \mathfrak{y} , for dd, ff, rh, s, th and y, the corresponding sounds in the common alphabet. He expresses the ng sometimes by \mathfrak{g} , and sometimes by the same character inverted \mathfrak{g} ; and at times he adds an h to l, r, s, t and z; as lh, rh, sh, th and zh; and thus makes a medley contradictory alphabet consisting of English, Saxon and

Greek

Greek characters: with all which it is necessary to be acquainted before you can read his dedication AT Y KYMRY prefixed to his book. This address like J. D. Rhys's dedication has been, I believe, hardly ever imitated, and perhaps but seldom read; the language of it is so greatly altered and disfigured; and besides this, the author himself is not steady and uniform to his own plan. In the two pages of the *Archaiologia Britannica* twice referred to already, he gives us one sort of alphabet; and he uses another very different in the above mentioned dedication.

I know of no other projects for this sort of reformation, only the learned Dr Davies used and recommended the use of γ , one of J. D. Rhys's characters, but even his recommendation and example has not been able to bring it into general practice: and all attempts to change letters once introduced, though in many instances wrong and defective, have yet been generally ineffectual. Even Roman
emperors,

emperors, who would fain have introduced only one or two new characters into the Latin alphabet, found they had not authority enough to make them current. So powerful, so prevalent is custom though ever so wrong,

Penes quem est jus & norma loquendi.

The Welsh must therefore endeavor to make themselves easy as to this matter, and continue to make use of the types and characters of the times. The translators and editors of the British Bible took these as they found them, though they were not in all respects so well adapted to their purpose. Thus the New Testament of 1567 appeared in the black letter, the common English type or character of that period ; and it made use of every letter of the English alphabet. It admitted even in common words the *k*, the *q*, and the *v* ; as in *llynku* instead of *llyngcu* ; *quilidd* instead of *cywilydd* ; and *cyvod* for *cyfod* ; which letters together

ther with the j, the x, and the z, should be used as they say, only in exotic or foreign words ; and have therefore since that time been discontinued, and other characters introduced in their stead. But observations relative to this article will fall in our way more naturally under the second part of this subject, to which it may be now full time to proceed.

PART

PART THE SECOND.

Peculiar genius and regulations of the British Tongue.

LANGUAGES as spoken are very fleeting and transitory things. They are mere aerial beings, created by the breath of man's mouth, and no sooner created than they cease to exist and perish for ever. Writing forms a body for these spiritual, momentary beings; it makes them objects of sight and substance, and gives them stability and duration. Their original appearance in this new created state was, most probably, very rude and irregular; like the first writings of a beginner, or the epistles of an ignorant peasant, awkward figures

and bad or false language. Human art and application improved upon these rough sketches and essays ; and time and opportunity reduced them to order, and made letters and languages become the subjects of laws and of government.

But such good fortune has not happened alike to every tongue. Hitherto no bodies at all have been created for the words of various languages. They have never yet been reduced by writing to a firm and permanent state ; and where they have been thus reduced and settled, they have met with very different degrees of regulation and improvement. The fortune of the British tongue, in this respect, it is my intention to consider in this second part.

This in general is the subject of grammar ; but a professed grammar is not here intended. Grammars for this language have been published already by Dr. Davis, Mr. Gambol, Mr. Richards and others ; to which I would refer such as desire more particular information this way. That
the

the reader however may have a clearer idea of the nature and structure of this tongue, it will be necessary to descend to some grammatical distinctions.

The distinction into three parts respecting letters, words and sentences, seems to be the most comprehensive, and the most natural division of grammar. Letters are the first, the raw materials or elements of a language—Words consisting of one or more of these elements are again only its materials in a second and more advanced state—And a combination of these last, regularly and properly disposed, constitutes a period or sentence. As under these several divisions, the Welsh tongue has some remarkable peculiarities; I shall attend to each of them in the following chapters, and in the order just mentioned.

CHAP. I.

Peculiar genius of the British alphabet.

THIS alphabet consists of twenty-eight letters—seven vowels and twenty-one consonants.

The vowels are a, e, i, o, u, w and y. The five first are vowels both in Welsh and in English; the two last are in English usually reckoned consonants, but improperly: The y in English has exactly the sound of the i, and is as much a vowel; and the double u is as much so as the single u; or rather as it consists of two u's, it is not a single, but a double vowel or diphthong.

The consonants are, b, c, ch, d, dd, f, ff, g, ng, h, l, ll, m, n, p, ph, r, rh*, s, t
and

* Rh is not set down as a distinct letter in the grammars of Dr. Davis and Mr. Richards; but they

and th. The remaining English characters j, k, q, v, x and z are used only for foreign words.

Should any think that this subject is low, little and disparaging to criticism, let them duly attend to what follows, and I am much mistaken or they will be of a different opinion. I have nothing material and peculiar to observe here of the vowels, what follows therefore respects the consonants and them only.

The distinction of them into single and double is unknown to the Welsh. Through the manifold defect of the common alphabet, they have plenty of double characters, but properly speaking, no double sounds; none compounded like the Greek ψ or the English x, and capable of being resolved into two separate and distinct sounds. Though the

letters

they both have in their dictionaries, where the single r has no place; which shews that on their own scheme, it ought to have had a place in their alphabets.

letters are double, the sound is simple and only one.

The consonants might be divided in the Welsh as in other languages into mutes and half vowels or liquids; but such a division would be attended with no great advantage.

A better division would be into labials, palatines and linguals or dentals, so denominated from the organs of speech, by which they are sounded. Labials pronounced by the lips are six, b, f, ff, m, p and ph; or rather five, as the ff and ph are only one and the same sound. Palatines pronounced by the palate or throat, are also five, c, ch, g, ng and h. The linguals or dentals sounded between the tongue and the teeth are ten, d, dd, l, ll, n, r, rh, s, t and th. This distinction is the more important, as letters of the same organ are often changed into one another in several languages, and in none more remarkably than in the Welsh.

But the principal and most useful division of these consonants would be into

into *initials*, and *non-initials*; or into such as begin radical British words, and such as begin none of them.

Non-initials are seven, dd, f, ng, l, ph, r and th, and they have this remarkable property; they will not stand at the head of any word of the language in its original state; they are not to be found in their order in any British dictionary; and all the words of that tongue must be sought for under some of the other letters *.

The initial consonants are fourteen, and must again be divided into *mutable* and *immutable*.

Immutables are five, ch, ff, h, n and s; they are in the main very steady and invulnerable; place them once in their proper station, and they will maintain their ground and give way to none.

The other nine, b, c, d, g, ll, m, p, rh and t are very properly called mutables, being at least most of them exceed-

I

ing

* Some few words may be found under f and l, but they are not reckoned radical British words.

ing variable and unsteady, frequently shifting their situation, and proteus-like assuming various shapes and appearances, some two, some three, and some four different forms.

In the changes and variations of these mutables, lies a great part of the art and mystery of this very peculiar tongue, the most curious perhaps, and the most delicate for its structure of any language in the world.

This may seem a strange expression : I should yet be very easy as to any charge of partiality or exaggeration on the account of it, if I could make the reader a perfect master of this subject ; its peculiarity must render it difficult ; I will however attempt to explain the *nature* and *use* of it ; and to this purpose I will transcribe from Dr. Davies's grammar the following scheme, which exhibits in one view the several changes of these letters.

Lit. Mutabiles	F O R M A			
	1	2	3	4
	Primaria recta seu radicalis	Mollis	Liquida	Aspirata
Declinatio.	1			
	C P T	Car Pen Tad	Gar Ben Dad	Nghar Mhen Nhad Char Phen Thad
	2			
	B D G	Bara Duw Gwr	Fara Dduw wr	Mara Nw Ngwr
	3			
	Ll M Rh	Llaw Mam Rhad	Law Fam Rad	

The learned author of the above table composed his British grammar in the Latin tongue ; and to explain the nature of his scheme, he uses Latin words and takes up the idea of declensions well known in that language. He divides his table into three declensions, and each declension into a certain number of forms or cases. The mutable letters are here ranged in one column ; they are thrown a little out of their alphabetical order, that they might be more conveniently

sorted and reduced to three declensions or classes.

The first declension consists of words beginning with c, p, or t, and appearing like nouns of so many terminations, under four different forms; or to keep closer to the idea of declensions, in four several cases: *Car, Gar, Ngbar, Char, &c.*

Declension the second consists of words beginning with b, d, or g, (making the second form of the first declension) and appearing like triptotes, under three forms or cases: *Bara, Fara, Mara, &c.*

The third declension again consists of words beginning with three letters, ll, m, or rh, and appearing like diptotes, only in two cases or forms: *Llaw, Law: Mam, Fam, &c.*

In every declension the word in its first form is in its absolute state, and begins with its primary or radical letter. From this state of the word every other form is deduced. The change is made *universally* into consonants of the same organ, but of a softer sound: *ec, eg, eng, &c.*

The

The second form is common to all the declensions; and its characteristic is *Mellis* that is, the radical letter softened; *Tad, Dad: Dww, Dduw, &c.* The third form extends only to the two first declensions; its denomination is *Liquida* implying a further degree of softness, or fluidity in the sound of its initials; *Car, Gar, Ngbar**, &c. The fourth form is peculiar to the first declension; and its characteristic is *Aspirata*, that is, the radical initial aspirated or pronounced with an *h*: *Pen, Pben: Tad, Thad, &c.*

Further helps to illustrate this matter might be derived from the Greek tongue. In that language, letters of the same organ of speech are frequently changed into one another. The formation of Greek verbs is in a great measure founded on this principle; and their characteristics are varied in a manner not unfamiliar to these mutations of British consonants. This, like

* The motion of the sound in this procession is easy and regular, but the expression of it by *ngb* is not so happy. The same may be said of some other characters used in these mutations.

like the former illustration, will appear more evident by a table representing the corresponding changes in each language. I shall here retain the examples of the preceding scheme, and place directly underneath each word the resembling parts of Greek verbs, and shall leave blanks where there are no corresponding changes.

Car Πλε-κω	Gar πεπλε-γμαι	Nghar	Char πεπλε-κα
Pen κρυ-πτω	Ben εκρυ-βην	Mhen κεκρυ-μμαι	Phen κεκρυ-φα
Tad αυυ-τω τρεχω	Dad	Nhad	Thad ηνυς-θην δρεξω
Bara λει-βω	Fara	Mara λειλει-μαι	
Duw α-δω	Dduw	Nuw	
Gwr. λε-γω	Wr	Ngwr	
Llaw ψα-λλω	Law ψα-λω		
Mam ρι-μω	Fam		
Rhad σπει-ρω	Rad		

The above scheme exhibits several variations of letters in each language formed alike, and upon the same principle. The Greek part indeed does not appear half as full as the British. One reason of that seems to proceed from a deficiency in the Greek alphabet; which has a smaller number of simple sounds than the Welsh: no *ng* or separate *b* among its palatines; no *f* i. e. *v* among its labials; nor the sound of *dd* amongst its dentals or linguals. For this cause, no changes in that tongue can correspond with *Fam* or *Fara*, with *Dduw* or with *Ngbar*.

Blanks in the Greek part of the preceding table, may also partly spring from another quarter. Transformations of letters in that tongue are not quite uniform, but frequently depart from the natural order. Only the two first conjugations seem to be perfectly regular. No others keep to letters of the same organ. τ, δ, θ, &c characteristics of the third and other conjugations do not, like the Welsh
change

change within their own class, but take up with preterites from the palatines or labials, consonants of a different tribe and order from their own. So fond is that tongue of letters of these classes, that no others appear in any of its preterites, except it may be a *delta* or *theta*, which by contraction or some other extraordinary method, become characteristics of a few preterites in the middle voice.

To illustrate this subject yet further, recourse might be had to the oriental languages. In the Hebrew alphabet are six mutable consonants, called *Litteræ Begadkephat*, having each of them a double sound, one soft and the other hard. For instance פרי signifying *fruit* is sounded in different positions, *Pri* or *Pbri*, with just the same variation as *Pen* and *Phen*, in the preceding tables: In the same manner תורה the Hebrew word for *Law* is pronounced *Torah* or *Tborah*, like the British *Tad* and *Tbad*. And so is בן a *son* like *Bara* and *Fara*, sounded sometimes *Ben*, and at other times *Fen* or rather *Ven*. But these mutations are much more limited

limited in this language than they are in the Welsh : changeable letters in Hebrew are only fix ; whereas in the British they are nine : in the Hebrew also, the change of these letters is only double ; whereas here they assume three or four different forms.

THE *use* as well as the nature of these mutations should be considered. They are of very general and extensive application. By dividing the first table into declensions and cases, its learned author did not mean to restrain the use of them to nouns and participles, or to such words as are the sole objects of declensions in Latin or Greek. Nor is it intended by comparing them in the second scheme to the characteristics of verbs, to limit their usage to such words as are the particular subjects of conjugations. They are of still more extensive application and utility ; being applicable to nouns, to verbs and to words of every other part of speech.

In general, they seem to have a two-fold tendency, one respecting the sound, the other respecting the signification of words.

The first and most obvious use of them is to distinguish the sound, to ease the pronunciation, and to render it smooth and harmonious. Two or more letters of the same organ and of the same sound joined together in a word are lost in pronunciation: they may harden or strengthen a sound, but if they are ever so many they can do no more, and must remain idle and indistinct. Some letters will not be sociable and succeed others; or if they must follow, they will do it with reluctance and difficulty, and give a harsh and discordant sound; vary these letters and dispose of them otherwise, and you will put an end to this disagreeable jarring, and make them concur in promoting a general sweetness and melody. For these purposes these changes are often introduced: no other reason need, no other reason can be assigned for several of them,

But

But their chief and principal use is to distinguish words, to shew their various relations and connections, and to fix and ascertain their proper meaning. That is the use of declensions, of conjugations and of other inflections of words in every language, and that seems to be the most important use of these changes of consonants in the British tongue. After a manner peculiar to themselves, they point out the number, gender &c, not of the substantive, for example, where the change happens, but of a pronoun, of an adjective or of some other word belonging to it; they form a main part of the syntax or construction of this language; and often contribute to render its words more distinct and emphatical.

I would fain hope what has been said may have brought the reader to be in some measure acquainted with this subject. If it has not proved sufficient for this end, I despair of being able to afford him that satisfaction, if it be a satisfac-

tion, and shall forbear giving him any further trouble this way.

WHATEVER it may have proved to the reader, it was a subject of importance to those who were concerned in the publications of the Welsh Bible, and they seem in general to have understood it well. The author of the first table had a considerable hand in the last translation of that book; and the principal conductors of most of its impressions have taken much pains to render their respective editions exact and accurate in this respect.

Too little attention however was shewn to this subject in the earliest impression of the New Testament. We find there *fy garedigion, ym plith* and *yn ty fy tad*, in the first declension, instead of *fy ngharedigion, ym mblith* and *yn nhy fy nbad*. And in the second declension we find *fy bara, yn duw* and *yn golwg*, instead of *fy mara, yn nuw* and *yngolwg*. It has been since conducted with more regularity and exactness. I cannot but ascribe much of this

this to the care and accuracy of the very learned Dr. Davies, to whom the language of his country is perhaps more indebted than to any other person whatsoever. Some of the earlier impressions in some few particulars have yet varied from his plan. They give *fyng byfammed* Gen. vi. 18. and *fyngboffadwriaeth* Exod. iii. 15. which according to the above scheme should have been *fy nghysammed* and *fyngboffadwriaeth*. Our latest and best correctors, I refer particularly to Mr. Morris and Mr. Williams, have kept more closely to the plan, and acted more upon the principles of that very able and accurate critic : they have directed their attention not only to initials, but likewise to middle and final letters ; and have thus given the language a further degree of ease and smoothness, rejecting the harsher consonants and substituting others of a softer sound in their place.

In *henw*, *gorchguddio* and *temptio*, they have rejected the h, the g and the p, and given us *enw*, *gorchuddio* and *temtio*. For
afswrn

asgwrn, *ysfryd*, *datcuddiad* and *ynthi*; they have printed *asgwrn*, *ysfryd*, *dadguddiad* and *ynddi*: turning the *c*, *p*, *t* and *th* into the softer sounds of *g*, *b*, *d* and *dd*. In the end of words, they have changed *det* into *deg*, *oblegit* into *oblegid*, &c according to the real spirit and genius of the language; which for the most part prefers the smoother and softer sounds to such as are more sharp and harsh.

I cannot but approve and upon the whole commend the general management of this affair. I heartily concur in maintaining the utility and necessity of most of the above changes; and if I call in question the propriety of any of them, it shall be done with a temper and conduct entirely consistent with a due respect for those who are of a different opinion.

My first difficulty respects the number of mutables in Dr. Davies's table: I wish the list had been otherwise settled, and that the *r* in particular had never been admitted. It seems to have very little
right

right to the character of a mutable consonant. There is a sensible difference between the sound of the *c* and *g*, and of all the other examples produced as instances of this variation; but between the pronunciation of *rh* and of the simple *r*, or between the sound of *rbad* and *rad* there does not seem to be any material difference.

Strike out the *r* and the third declension will appear simple and plain, and stand clear of every difficulty; but so much cannot be said of the other two.

The second declension is more simple than the first and attended with the least difficulty. It labors however under one mistake, and may be liable to some other objections. Words beginning with a *g* are represented as turning their radical *g* into a *w* in the second form; but this is not accurately represented. The *g* there is not changed into another letter but is wholly excluded, and the *w* remains just where it did; and so would any other letter which might happen immediately

mediately to follow the *g*. *Garda* makes *ardd* and *glin* makes *lin* &c. In the other examples of this declension, the transition from the first to the second state appears easy and natural; but that to the third form is not so clear and evident; the words seem somewhat disguised, further removed from their original state and of more difficult investigation.

These objections may be made to the first declension with yet greater force and propriety. From the first to the second state, the transition is easy and plain; so is the transition to the fourth case; but the change into the third form seems rather difficult and queer. *C* changes into *ngb*, *p* into *mb*, and *t* into *nb*, characters not in the alphabet and of an awkward make. They are displeasing to the eye, if not to the ear, and they obscure both the origin and meaning of a word. *Yng ngbaer*, *ym mbabell* and *yn nby*, derived from *caer*, *pabell* and *ty*, appear very much disguised and not easy to be traced home to their proper source.

It

It may be said, that what is awkward here proceeds from the defect of the alphabet and its want of proper characters—that these mutations do not obscure or disguise more than the changes, and probably not near so much, as the changes of characteristics in Greek verbs—and even, that however they may disfigure or disguise, they are yet necessary and unavoidable, and must therefore be endured.

The defect of the alphabet I have acknowledged already : disguise and obscurities arising from the changes of Greek characteristics must also be admitted : and where such transformations are necessary and unavoidable, I will assent to the continuance of *mb*, *nb*, *ng* and even of *ngb*, the queerest figure of the whole corps. But I would not bear with them any further ; and I could wish particularly with regard to the two last, that whenever they come together, one of them might be obliterated, and the other suffered to remain alone. But,

L

Some

Some scripture instances of these changes are not at all necessary and might, as well if not better, have been omitted. *Saith mawch*, Gen. xli. 20. *Pym-nyn*, Gen. xlviii. 2. &c, are of this sort ; variations unnecessary and unusual : and the words are more plain, as well as more common in another form : *saith mawch* and *pym dyn*. So also 1 Pet. i. 2. *Duw Dad* exhibits a needless mutation, and would have been as plain and founded better *Duw y Tad*.

In other cases, changes are omitted, where they might and I think ought to have been introduced. Gen. i. 8. we read *ail dydd*, and so uniformly wherever it appears : good judges of the language tell me it is right : but my ear, the custom of the country as far as I can remember it, and the analogy of the language, all assure me that it is not right, and that it ought to have been *ail Ddydd*. *Dydd* is the absolute state of the word or its nominative case, if I may so call it : but that is not the state which follows the word *ail* in other instances.

instances. We never say *ail perſon* or *ail gwaith*, but *ail berſon* and *ail nwaith*; and for the ſame reaſon, we ſhould not ſay *ail dydd* but *ail ddydd*.

One thing more I would juſt mention under this article, that in purſuance to this ſcheme of changes and upon the ſame principles; the conjunction *ac* ſhould, when followed by a vowel, be alter'd into *ag*; and the initial radical guttural *ch*, if not wholly omitted, might yet be made a mutable and its harſh ſound frequently avoided. There ſeems to be the more reaſon for ſo doing, as this letter, I mean the initial and radical *ch*, is ſeldom or never pronounced in ſome parts of the country. They never ſay *chwær* or *chwertbin*, but *bwær* or *bwertbin*, throwing away the *c* and retaining only the *h*.

It will be ſaid, theſe are minutiae, little matters and hardly worth notice. I own it, and at the ſame time I will ſay in return; the eaſe, the harmony, the perſpicuity, the elegance and the ſpirit

of languages are frequently much affected by little things ; and if I may be indulged the comparison, like the peace of families, or even the fate of kingdoms, often depend upon — trifles.

C H A P. II.

Nature and peculiarities of parts of speech
in the British tongue.

OF letters, the preceding materials are formed words, the materials again of language in a second and more advanced state. Words may be considered either with regard to their meaning, or else with regard to their make and form; the last of which--the form of words--is the subject of this part, by far the most copious and most laboured part of grammar.

The most natural and the most general division of words is, like that of letters, into *mutable* and *immutable*; or as this has been used to be expressed into *declinable* and *indeclinable*. This distinction is rather slighted by English grammarians, as not applicable to their language, which properly speaking has no declensions. But
the

the idea of declensions strictly so called is not, at least ought not to be the idea here affixed to declinable and indeclinable. The idea is the same with that of mutable and immutable; and it is applicable to all languages, and constitutes the first and most obvious distinction of words.

Look into any book, no matter whether the language of it be understood or not, it is sufficient if its letters are known and its words distinguished from one another; and you will presently see some of its words every where uniform and alike; of exactly the same members and magnitude; or consisting of the same number of syllables, and of the very same letters; others you will see changeable and differing from themselves; sometimes shorter and sometimes longer; consisting in different places of different letters and of more or fewer syllables.

INDECLINABLE or immutable words, which are also the most simple and the least numerous, include according to the
most

most common grammar, *adverbs*, *conjunctions*, *prepositions* and *interjections*.

The last mentioned (odly enough called *interjection*) seems the most natural and inartificial part of speech, if it may be called a part of it, and is not rather a peculiar sort of language by itself. Its words seem the rudest and most imperfect of all words, being nothing more than an *ah*, or an *oh*, or some such sudden exclamation. They are invariable to a peculiar degree, being much the same in all languages, and in all ages of the world. They are a part of language little affected even by the general confusion of tongues; and whatever changes may happen to languages in future, this part of them will remain alike and the same; as long as the feelings, as long as the sighs and groans of the philosopher and of the savage, or of men in every age, condition and country, will remain alike and the same. This part of man's language seems little different from that of the animals below him. It is a
simple

simple effort of nature to relieve itself in certain cases. It forms but a very small number of words in any dictionary, and is the class of which grammarians have had the least to say.

Next to the interjection, the most simple and the least artificial of the invariable parts of speech, are the conjunction and the preposition. These consist generally of a single letter or monosyllable ; and in some instances, they may amount to words of two syllables. As of themselves they convey no idea or meaning, they therefore never appear alone, but always in company and in attendance upon some other words : and they are employed to connect or to separate these ; or like harbingers and ushers to go before and introduce them. Both together they constitute but a small part of the words of any language ; and usually good grammars and dictionaries here and contain them all.

The adverb, reputed another indeclinable part of speech, is yet not so steady and
invariable

invariable as the former : neither is it as simple and inartificial as the conjunction or preposition. In some instances it is short and uncomplicated. *As, bis* and *twice* ; *hic, here* and *yma* are little diminutive words, of a size and appearance suitable to their condition and servile character. But in other instances adverbs are words of bulk and dignity. They assume, especially in English, an air of peculiar importance, appearing sometimes rather bigger and more substantial than almost any other words of the language. *Surprizingly, superlatively* and *surreptitiously*, may serve as examples of this kind.

In the British tongue, adverbs are of a more humble and more simple form, and also much fewer than in the English. Adverbs of number, in the strict and proper sense, I think we have not. Those of time, of place and some others we have, but not in such plenty as in other languages ; and their place is supplied by other words or modes of expression, of

M

which

which in fact and in all languages adverbs are only substitutes. Sometimes a substantive and preposition means just the same as an adverb. To judge the world righteously is expressed, Acts xvii. 31, by *in righteousness* in English, and in Welsh by *merwn Cyfiawnder*. But more commonly, this is expressed by a preposition and the adjective without any substantive. Soberly, righteously and godly, Tit. ii. 12, we render *yn sobr, yn gyfiawn ag yn dduwiol*; that is literally, *in sober, in righteous and in godly*; very awkward I acknowledge and nonsensical in English; but not at all so in the British where they stand, but full as proper and as expressive, as *soberly, righteously and godly*; or as *at most*, and as *from everlasting to everlasting*, is in English.

MUTABLE words, or parts of speech vary even in their division—some distinguishing them into three parts * viz.

Names,

• Brightland's Grammar.

Names, Qualities and Affirmations—some dividing them into four †, *Nouns, Pronouns, Verbs and Participles*—others into five †, *Article, Pronouns, Substantives, Adjectives and Verbs*. The last seems the most natural and the most suitable to my fancy and plan; and I shall therefore follow it in what I have further to say on this part of the subject.

Here again the two first are very uncomplicated and few in number. The article is only a y, a single letter which in some cases takes to itself an r. The pronoun also is very simple, consisting of one or two syllables at most. The personal pronouns are likewise few and by nature herself limited to three. They are however very variable and irregular perhaps in most languages, and seem to have nothing peculiar in the British tongue, except it be that in each person, they are rather in greater plenty and more redundant than in the English, the Latin,

M 2

† Lilly's Grammar. † Louth's Grammar.

or the Greek. From the air which they assume, one would often think them of the greatest consequence : but their diminutive size takes off much of their importance, and their denomination of *pro-nouns* humbles and lessens them still more ; according to which, words of this class like the adverb, are mere substitutes and only stand in the room of others.

The substantive, the adjective and the verb--the three remaining sorts of words--are by much the most important and the most numerous parts of speech. They are the most artificial and complicated of any, and liable to a prodigious variety of changes and vicissitudes. Substantives and adjectives are declinable by cases, numbers and genders : adjectives appear different also according to their different degrees of comparison : and verbs vary by their voices, their moods and their tenses, and by their numbers and persons. But I don't mean here to run through the several variations of these sorts of words, any more than I intend to give a compleat list of
their

their number; one of which is the business of a dictionary, and the other the particular province of a professed grammar. I shall rather take these three principal parts of speech together and consider them in two views, equally applicable to them all.

Wherever we find them, they will appear upon examination to be—either *simple* or *compound*—either *derived* or *underived*—either in their original and primitive, or else in their varied and improved state. Words simple and underived, or words in their first and primitive state, I look upon as the first and original words of a language, as the capital stock with which it set out at the beginning, or as the prime materials put into its hands, if I may so express myself, to manufacture and improve. The others, the compound and derived, or words in their varied and improved state, I consider as the acquired stock of a language, as the fruits of its own labour and industry, which it
has

has manufactured and prepared for its own use.

Simple and uncompounded substantives in their nominative case and singular number ; adjectives of like make, in the same state and perhaps of the masculine gender, and in the positive degree ; and such verbs in the first person singular of the present tense, indicative mood and active voice, give us the *primitives* or underived words of a language in their first state. All inflections and variations from these primitives, whether by formation or composition, whether by declensions, conjugations or comparisons give us the *derivatives* and more labored words of the same tongue. Of these two classes ; the first, that is the primitives are the least in size and in number ; they are likewise the dictionary words or the roots in every language ; the others, the derivatives are more bulky and in greater plenty. If we may judge by the proportion between the nominative case singular

singular and other cases of the same substantive ; more especially, if we judge by the proportion between the first person of the verb and the other parts of it ; we shall find the derivatives to be the most numerous to a prodigious degree. They would swell to a most amazing number, and no dictionary could contain a tenth part of them ; but a great many of them are so regular and plain, that they never need, and seldom do appear in any.

In preparing and using these derivatives consists the principal difference of languages, and the vast advantage of some above others.

The common solution or analysis of words into so many, no matter how many parts of speech, may be equally applicable to every language under the sun. The underived and primitive words of several tongues may also greatly resemble one another and be nearly the same, as proceeding from the same stock, perhaps from the original language of man. But a
most

most wide and amazing difference will be found in their derivatives. Some languages, if I may so speak, treat their original stock like a spendthrift, or like the slothful servant, take no pains to improve it : they ever use these materials in their first condition, or in their stunted and dwarfish state : while others have labored and manufactured them, compounded and decompounded them so as surprizingly to vary, to increase and multiply their first and original quantity.

The Latin and Greek tongues seem to have distinguished themselves the most in this respect. If we examine any composition in either of these languages, grammars and dictionaries excepted, we shall find but few words in their simple and primitive state ; hardly any monosyllables among the substantives, adjectives or verbs ; and if they are thus constituted in their original form, as soon as they pass from this state, they become polysyllables, words of bulk and substance,

stance, which look well and seem to add weight and dignity to a sentence or period.

The English on the other hand seems to have done very little this way. With all its tendency and disposition to manufactures and improvement, it has neglected the manufacture and improvement of its own words. It has gone upon the idle lazy principle of borrowing and importing ; and rather than take the pains to work and labour its own materials, it has chose to become debtor to the French, to the Latin, to the Greek or to any other language, which would trust it with terms ready made and at second hand. To this day it uses its own native words much in their original state, or rather in a less and more diminutive form. Near two thirds perhaps of the words of this language in its present condition are monosyllables. Exclude from it all foreign derivatives, and then these *little stunted dwarfish* things will appear in a much more disproportionate number. “ Whole lines in a large

book will be found like a string of beads, made up of words all of one and the same size."

Its derivatives as well as its primitives are frequently of this sort. Adjectives admit of no variety, except that of comparison : and the variations of substantives and verbs often add nothing to their substance and magnitude. Love for instance, is a substantive and only one syllable in both numbers. Love also is a verb and almost the same in every person. Change the singular into the plural, and join ever so many substantives and persons together, yet the word remains still as unimportant and as simple as ever. Of this fact *man men, tooth teeth, way and ways*, and hundreds of others are sufficient proof. Most of the varieties of cases and comparisons, of tenses and moods abounding in some other languages, are here answered by little servile words called helpers. The most substantial, I had almost said the only substantial grammatical variation in the whole extent

extent of the English tongue, is the present active participle.

THE Welsh language has in this respect considerably the advantage of the English; and two circumstances in particular have gained it this advantage.

In the first place, it has more varieties and more substantial grammatical derivatives under each of those parts of speech which we are now considering. Substantives singular become plural several ways, and in some cases even two syllables may be thus added to a word; as *dyn dynion*, man men, *tyst tystion*, witness witnesses, &c. Adjectives take up these plural additions as well as substantives; as *gwyn gwynion*, white; *trwm trymion*, heavy: they have other means of becoming plural besides: they have also a variation in their genders, *gwyn, gwen*: and they have even what may be called a fourth degree of comparison expressive of equality; as *glan, glanach, glanaf, glaned*; *clean, cleaner, cleanest, as clean*.

Verbs in general, especially in the active voice, vary their persons and numbers, their tenses and moods by distinct and particular terminations, and have no need of a large troop of petty auxiliaries or supporters, such as *can, may, could, should, shall, will, &c, &c.* without which an English verb cannot stand, or stands for nothing : and they have yet further amongst them a species of reciprocal verbs or verbs transitive on themselves, like the *hithpahel* of the Hebrew.

The second circumstance, giving the Welsh an advantage over the English in this matter, is the greater liberty it has taken to manufacture its own materials to compound its words and to form a set of derivatives different from the above ; and the same as have hitherto alone claimed the name of derivatives. Some of these are double, treble and yet more complicated shoots from single stocks ; and they grow and thrive in great plenty on almost every British part of speech : others of them are formed from the concurrence

currence and united efforts of two or three primitives joined together; which in either case become compleat and distinct words, by adding the particular terminations of verbs, adjectives or substantives. While the English has gone about borrowing of the French, of the Latin or Greek; the Welsh has been creating and forming words of its own: and there seems to have been a special tendency in this language thus to increase and multiply. By this means it has acquired a considerable superiority in this respect, and is in possession of several verbs and other words, to which I know of none corresponding in the English tongue, as *dyddbau*, *bwyrbau*, &c, &c.

There are derivatives of this sort manufactured in Britain by its original inhabitants, which in my opinion are not only superior to any thing English in the same way, but are at least equal to any productions of the same kind in ancient Rome or Greece. Instances will be here expected to make good such an assertion,

tion. I shall content myself with giving two or three instead of many. The first shall be what I may call a double derivative from one single root—the second a compound formed from two substantives—and the other a derivative, formed from three single and distinct words.

Arglwyddiaeth and *arglwyddiaethu* are British goods of the first sort, home made and derived from *arglwydd*. *Dominium* and *dominor* from *dominus*; *Κυριος* and *Κυριου* from *Κυριος* are the corresponding words of Latin and Greek workmanship in the same way. I would likewise fain add their English correspondents: from the monosyllable *lord*, I can derive *lordship* a substantive of two syllables; but I can proceed no further; if there is a verb, it is of the same diminutive form with the primitive. Here the industry and inventive genius of the English fails, but the skill and artifice of the British is at least equal to that of Rome and Greece.

Again,

Again, *croeshoelio* is a British verb, formed by the union of two substantives *croes* cross and *hoel* nail. It is expressive of the manner in which the Son of God was put to death ; and it expresses it stronger and more emphatically than any words used in this case by the English, the Greek or the Latin. The English word *to crucify*, according to the genius and analogy of the language, may signify to make or to be made a cross, as well as to die upon it. The Greek term *σταυρον* is no more than *staking* or fastening to a pole. The Latin *crucifigo*, more expressive here than either of the former (as the punishment was Roman) yet means no more than fastening to a cross, which may be done various ways. But the Welsh determines the manner of it, and conveys the particular and striking idea of fixing to the cross with nails.

Further, *cydymgyngborant*, Isaiah xlv. 21, is another British compound derivative, formed of *cyd*, *ym* and *cyngbor*, three distinct words, two prepositions and one substantive.

stantive. It conveys an idea in that passage, which neither Hebrew, Greek nor Latin express without using two different words ; and to express the same idea in English, no less than *five* different and distinct words are used.

In both the above respects therefore, that is, in the changes and variations of nouns and verbs, and in the more general formation of other derivatives, the British tongue has greatly the advantage over the English.

I must however acknowledge with regard to derivatives of the first sort, particularly the inflections of verbs ; that the British is not so full and perfect as the Greek and Latin. Active participles I think it has none. *Caredig* sometimes so called, is rather an adjective or participial chiefly signifying passively, and never retaining like a true active participle the transitive nature of the verb. It also wants the present tense in the active voice : and for the passive voice, it has but few distinct tenses and terminations.

Like

Like the Latin and Greek (both of which are here considerably defective) it supplies the place of these terminations and tenses by the passive participle and the substantive verb, used with a pronoun after the particular manner of impersonals : or else it supplies this deficiency after a manner peculiar to itself, by the verb substantive put impersonally, and the other verb put substantively, and preceded by a possessive pronoun and preposition : *yr ydys yn fy ngharu*, I am loved, &c.

With regard to the other set of derivatives I would suggest a few thoughts and then finish this article. Words of this class are undoubtedly the proper subjects of our regulation and criticism : much more so than the original and primitive words of a language. To object to primitives is like objecting to natural and constitutional bodily imperfections. But objecting to derivatives is objecting to things of our own making, which if they are wrong, must be so partly through

O

our

our own fault. But the misfortune is, here are no rules to direct our conduct ; or if there be, they are *leges non scriptæ*, such as have hardly ever appeared in any grammatical code or system of laws. The English never wanted them, and therefore may never have thought of them. But others, especially the Greeks, wanted them and must have made use of some regulator, though perhaps unknown to themselves as well as to us. They had simple derivatives, beginning their variations with three or four syllables, such as *τιτινθωμαι, τυφθωμαι, &c* ; prefix to these a preposition of two syllables ; and then add a termination of as many more, and their size would become monstrous indeed—they would be truly *sesquipedalia verba*, almost literally words of a foot and a half long. We have no British words of such prodigious length, but we have such as are long enough, which upon an increase of termination are in common discourse contracted by custom in their radical part,
and

and which in like circumstances should, in my opinion, be abridged by authors in the same manner.

From *tragywydd* for instance we form *tragywyddol*, and again from thence *tragywyddoldeb*, derivatives, especially the last seemingly full long for increase and for pronunciation ; but in fact, as far as I can recollect they are never pronounced as here written ; they are pronounced *tragwyddol* and *tragwyddoldeb*, the first y of the radical excluded, and the words themselves shortened one syllable. They are then easy to pronounce and to manage, and they had best always be so written.

The like conduct would not perhaps be improper for long substantives, which take an addition of two syllables to become plural ; as *gorchymmin* which regularly in the plural is *gorchymminion*, a word of five syllables, but I believe always pronounced as if only four and as if written *gorchmynion*. In these cases a

distinct character † has been recommended for the first y ; which character was to be a vowel, to be pronounced and yet like the Hebrew sheva, make no syllable : but probably the easiest and most effectual way would be to exclude it entirely : for we may change the spelling and accommodate it to common pronunciation, when we have no authority to coin a new letter and make it current.

I have no other regulations at present to wish, with regard to these derivatives ; except it be—that such of them as are compounded of two or more words might always retain, as much as possible, the features of each parent ; in which respect some of them may be a little deficient, as Gen. ii. 21, *drym-gwsg*, rather *drawm-gwsg* : and likewise—that all of them, whether compounded or not, might be formed, as near as may be,

to

† The character is the last in the fourth column of the table of alphabets, in page 44 of these sheets.

to resemble other words of the language in the same part of speech, in order to be more easily governed by the same laws. Thus I would wish *bedyddiwr*, *rbagrithiwr*, &c would cast off the *i* of the penult, and become *bedyddwr*, *rbagrithwr*, &c ; that together with *breuddwydwr*, *llafurwr*, &c they might with more ease and regularity change into the plural *bedyddwyr*, *rbagrithwyr*, *llafurwyr*, &c.

C H A P. III.

Nature and peculiar construction of sentences in the British tongue.

HITHERTO we have considered words as single and unconnected : but they are not to be met with in that state, except in grammars or dictionaries. In other books they are brought, as I may say to one place, disposed in a particular manner and joined together by certain bands, according to rule and in due form of law. To regulate this matter is the business of syntax, the third and last part of grammar.

The first use of syntax *surraçis* perhaps was military ; and from marshalling men and drawing up an army, was transferred to signify the disposing and regulation of words in a sentence. If this account of its origin be true, the primary
idea

idea here will be that of *ranking*, and the first work of syntax will be to settle the order and precedence of the different parts of speech, according as they stand in competition for place.

Parts of speech in apposition as they are called, that is two or more words signifying one and the same thing, will in all languages be considered as upon a par, and rank and take place indifferently as may best suit their ease and convenience.

What are called genitive cases, or words under government, like good and dutiful subjects will keep behind and follow their superiors. In Welsh however, they receive no increase of bulk as in the Latin ; they want no preposition to attend them after the manner of the English ; nor do they take off a piece of the preceding word in imitation of the Hebrew : Let them immediately follow their leaders as *meibion dynion*, and they are as easily and as certainly understood,

understood, as *fili hominum*, sons of men
 or בני אדם.

When substantives and adjectives become competitors for rank, the English in general declare against the substantive and give precedence to the adjective, as *wise men*; the Welsh on the other hand, for the most part and more naturally give the first and chief place to the substantive, as *dynion doethion*, men wise.

As to other different and contending parts of speech, the English very naturally make the substantive and nominative case mostly to precede the verb; but in British as in Latin and Greek and other languages, this matter is in a great measure indifferent: the verb again in its turn generally goes before what is called the accusative case; and other words lead or follow, as the sound shall direct, or as an author pleases, to whom great latitude is here allowed.

BESIDES

BESIDES ranking, a further and more common idea of syntax is concord, which consists in a certain agreement between the three principal parts of speech, supposed to be settled either by nature herself, or else by the authoritative decisions and statute law of grammarians. This requires substantives and adjectives to agree in their respective variations of number, case and gender : it requires the nominative case and the verb to agree in number and person : and it directs the relative to accord with its antecedent in number and gender. These are the general rules and laws of concord, and they are supposed to be universal and applicable to every language. But there are few laws and ordinances of men which deserve universal obedience ; and fewer still which have never been transgressed.

In the British tongue the first law of concord is frequently neglected. As in the Hebrew so here, plural adjectives particularly numerals are connected with their substantives in the singular number,

as *dau ddyn*, two man; *wyth enaid*, eight soul &c. Not that this discord if I may so call it, is the invariable custom of the language: it has three different methods for this purpose, either of which may be indifferently followed: we say *saith merch*, seven daughter; *saith merched*, seven daughters; or *saith o ferched*, of daughters seven. But so common and seemingly so regular is the first method, that I could almost blame the translators of the bible for deviating from this practice, in some instances which they have given us of a substantive plural with a plural adjective, as Exod. ii. 16; where we have *saith merched*, seven daughters; which for my own part I will acknowledge, I should have been better pleased with, if it had been *saith merch*, that is seven daughter. Again, as the plural adjective will sometimes have a substantive singular, so on the contrary a substantive plural will not unfrequently put up with an adjective of the singular number,

as *gwyr mawr*, not *mawrion*; *arglwyddi caled*, not *caledion*.

The second law of concord has more regard paid to it in the British tongue. Verbs generally agree, as to number with the nominative case of the substantive; but yet not without several exceptions. When a substantive singular is joined to a plural adjective, in that case the verb will be plural and agree with the adjective rather than with the substantive; so Gen. xli. 26, *y saith dywysen deg ydynt* not *sydd saith mlynedd*; the seven good ear are, not is seven year. This example is the reverse of another not uncommon deviation from the present rule; wherein the verb substantive and several other verbs in the singular number are connected with nominative cases in the plural, *yr oedd taranau*, Exod. xix. 16; *bydded goleuadau*, Gen. i. 14, that is, there was thunders &c, &c.

So far I can approve, and will take upon me to justify the conduct of a bold language, which disdains the controul of

grammatical statute laws, where the common law of custom, its original and rightful sovereign has left it free. The language of the sons of science and of liberty in ancient Greece acted in the same manner. Neuters plural in that tongue had their verbs generally of the singular number : and *ἐστὶ οἱ τρεῖς there is persons* is current, is sterling Greek and to be found in the best authors. In both languages this liberty is taken principally with the substantive verb and its cognates or relatives. Perhaps it would have been best to have stopped here, and not have extended this practice to some instances which might be produced ; such as *y llynynnau a fyrthbiodd*, Psalm xvi. 6, the lines *is* fallen, rather undoubtedly *are* fallen *a fyrthbiasant*.

Can di amblantadwy nid esgorodd, Isai. liv. 1, introduced as an example of a nominative case in the second person joined to a verb of the third person is, I think, first misunderstood and then of course wrong placed ; it rather belongs to the
third

third rule of concord, or the agreement between the relative and the antecedent.

This rule requires the relative to agree with the antecedent in number and gender—some grammarians add—in person. The rule itself is not very material in this tongue as the relative is often, Dr. Davies says, is most frequently suppressed *. In the above passage of the prophet however, the relative *yr bon* is expressed in italics, as not in the Hebrew. And I had much rather make this relative to be of the third person, and consequently the regular nominative case to the verb *esgorodd*, than consider this relative as in the second person, and so introduce a species of concord or rather discord, which the peculiarities of no language seem sufficient to vindicate or excuse. In the English and other translations of the above cited passage, the verb is taken up in the second person; thou that *didst*
not

* Antiq. Ling. Britan. Rudimenta. pag. 171.

not travail with child : but it is not so in the original, the literal translation of that is, thou who *did* not travail &c, corresponding exactly with the British version ; and all the irregularity is—a relative which may be of any person is regularly connected with a verb in the third person, and somewhat irregularly refers to an antecedent in the second.

To these peculiarities of construction in parts of sentences commonly preceding the verb, might be added others in parts which usually follow it. We have no difference of cases or final terminations of words ; and therefore no government by verbs of accusative, dative or other cases, as in Latin or Greek. What is remarkable and worthy of notice here is the frequent use of certain prepositions, particularly of the preposition *yn* after several verbs in the construction of sentences. They twain shall be one flesh, Matt. xix. 5, according to the Greek is—they shall be *in* one flesh. The sentence
and

and the form of its construction is borrowed from Gen. ii. 24, and is a literal translation of the Hebrew. A construction exactly similar to this appears in the same passage of Genesis in the Welsh; but there it is natural and not borrowed; it is no imitation of the Hebrew, but an original British construction, where it is much more familiar and more common than in the Hebrew itself.

After the verb substantive and other verbs, we introduce the preposition *yn* to precede nouns substantive in cases where nothing like it appears in the original. Gen. i. v, *Duw a alwodd y goleuni yn ddydd, a'r tywyllwch a alwodd efe yn nos*; God called the light *in* day, and the darkness he called *in* night, &c. *Yn* is also frequently used, like the *ο* of the Greeks, before the infinitive mood without any pattern for it in the Hebrew; Gen. i. 6, *bydded y ffurfafen yn gwahanu rhwng y dyfroedd*; let the firmament be *in* divide or dividing between the waters, &c. And further without any precedent from the Hebrew, the Greek,

or

or perhaps any other language, it is very often introduced before adjectives alone ; Gen. ii. 25, *yr oeddynt ill dau yn noethion* ; and they were both *in* naked, &c. These instances of construction must seem strange, especially to persons not much acquainted with languages ; but such as are conversant in these matters well know, that the peculiarities of all languages appear awkward when literally translated into others, but are nevertheless essential and necessary to themselves, and the omission of them constitutes a species of false syntax : witness *edrych wyneb-pryd* James i. 23, in the Welsh bible ; which in my opinion is an instance of wrong construction, and should have been *edrych ar wyneb-pryd*. But,

FURTHER to enlarge on these particulars would carry me beyond my plan ; what has been said may be sufficient to give some idea of the nature and peculiarities of the British tongue, and of their effect on the stile and language of the
Welsh

Welsh bible; which was the professed intention of this second part.

Of kin to these are two other circumstances of some influence, which I shall therefore briefly mention before I put a period to these remarks. One is the particular circumstance of dialect; and the second is the general nature of British compositions, previous to the version of the bible into Welsh. Among the Latins, Livy is said to have his *pata-vinity*, and Xenophon among the Greeks to be both *attic* and *homerick*: and not only these writers, but every author will discover in his compositions, both the particular dialect of his native place, and also the general cast and course of his reading.

The persons concerned in the Welsh versions and impressions of the bible have been for the most part inhabitants or natives of North Wales. The language of that part of the principality differs in some respects from the language of the South. It forms a particular dialect, and something of this dialect

Q

seems

seems to have been introduced by our translators into their versions. *Yrwan* for *yr awrbon*, 1 Pet. i. 8, of the first translation; *twymn* and *twymmo* for *twym* and *twymo* in many places of the present version; and some others in every version are of this kind and after the manner of North Wales.

The second circumstance must have been still more operative and influential. Printed books in the Welsh tongue, as I have observed already, are mostly of a date subsequent to the British translation of scripture, and therefore cannot be supposed to have had here any great effect. But there were manuscript compositions among the Britons prior to that era; and these were principally poetical, the works of their much favored and very venerable bards. As by the perusal of these, I suppose our translators to have formed their stile, and fixed what I may call their particular manner; something of this sort must not only appear in their translation, but also in the subsequent turn, and in the general cha-

character of the language since. Hence perhaps several of the peculiarities already mentioned; and it may be some others not reducible to any particular class. Hence I would derive *gwyypont* for *gwybyddont*; *pum-nyn* for *pump-dyn*; *oni ddelo* for *kyd oni ddelo*; and *mae Abel* for *pa le y mae Abel dy frawd* &c. These words and sentences look like the expressions of Poets, they are contracted and deficient in their make or construction, and seem as if diminished on purpose to make them answer the particular nature and measure of poetic compositions.

There are some other words and modes of expression, of which I should have been glad to have given an account: such as *ffun* for spirit, *berlod* for a lad, *gofwyo* for to visit, &c. But I will freely acknowledge, I have not acquaintance enough with the language to determine, whether they are poetical terms, or whether they are words of a particular dialect in present use, or else such as

Q₂ were

were once familiar and common, but are now antiquated. I will therefore here finish these remarks, and refer to some abler hand the continuance of what has been overlooked and omitted, as well as the correction of whatever has been said amiss.

C O N C L U S I O N.

IN the preceeding observations, I have attempted to give such as are conversant with languages and strangers to the British, some idea of its nature and peculiarities. A more intimate acquaintance and a further study of this subject, I would fain recommend to my countrymen, particularly to those among them who are persons of leisure and learning; and I would venture to insure them in that case both profit and pleasure.

Their mother tongue was very probably once the most general and extensive
of

of any in Europe. In a long course of many ages, it may have been affected by some intermixtures from other languages: but it yet retains more of its ancient character, more of its original independence and purity than perhaps any other tongue in present use. In its letters, in its make and construction, it is artificial and curious to a peculiar degree. In its different parts and sorts of words, it is sounding expressive and substantial. It has a particular aptitude to vary and to multiply; and from a few simple primitives to branch out and to form derivatives of good mein, of easy and strong signification, and in great plenty. And in its disposition and construction of words in a sentence, it has a liberty and variety unknown to many others. This character of it is founded on its state in a translation, where it must have labored under considerable difficulties; an original composition by the authors of that translation, would very probably have set it off to greater advantage. Yet even thus examined and considered,

considered, it appears highly deserving the attention and study, particularly of the inhabitants of the principality.

This subject may deserve their regard, not only as curious, but as capable of throwing light on some particulars of the history and antiquities of this country. I will take the liberty to suggest one instance or inference of this kind; and then grant the reader his full and final discharge. From the genius and character of the language therefore, I would infer the state and character of the more ancient inhabitants of Britain.

Their language was artificial, was labored and in a more advanced degree of improvement. I can't help looking upon it as a most venerable, as a most ancient monument of British genius and of British art—more ancient and more indubitable than their coins or their castles—and more truly and more peculiarly Welsh than even their mountains. The original, the plain and the simple language of primitives may have
been

been the immediate gift and donation of Heaven: the bold and figurative language of tropes and metaphors may be the effect of the genius and fire of Indians or Savages: but the regular the labored language of derivatives looks like the effect of the skill and industry of those who use them. Had we no other monument of Grecian history and art than the mechanism if I may so call it, or than the labored and artificial character of their language, that alone would be deemed a sufficient evidence of their being a knowing and improved people. From the same consideration I see no reason why we should not draw the like Conclusion with regard to the former inhabitants of this island.

In times past they have been represented as Barbarians and Savages, as ignorant and destitute of almost every improvement and convenience of life; but such a representation seems to have been as untrue as it was unfriendly.

The

The peculiar the improved character of their tongue is, to say the least of it, a strong presumption—that the ancient Celtæ, and in particular the ancient inhabitants of Britain were not in the lowest, but in a more improved state of civilization and knowlege. Let Britons of the present day therefore study and be well acquainted with this most ancient and most undoubted monument of the art and skill of their ancestors. Should such a conduct be in any measure the effect of these remarks—I shall think myself happy in having prepared them—and look upon every attending trouble as abundantly compensated.

F I N I S.



Lately published by the same Author,

An Historical Account of the British or
Welsh Versions and Editions of the Bible.

Besides giving an account of the several translations and impressions of the Scriptures, the above history considers the measures proposed for discontinuing the Welsh language, and for introducing the English in its stead—it examines particularly the scheme of withholding for this purpose from the inhabitants of the principality, the free use of the bible and the public exercises of religion in their native tongue—it shews such a scheme to be entirely unprotestant and unchristian—to be very improper and ineffectual to answer the end proposed—and further, that the end itself, if accomplished would be of no great public benefit to either country, as England has already all the advantageous intercourse with Wales in the way of trade, which it could have, if the English tongue was the only language used in every part of the principality.

(continued from page 1)

AN INDEPENDENT REPORT OF THE BOARD OF
MANAGEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[illegible]